

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,560	08/22/2003	Wensheng Huang	040072-243	9173
	7590 01/08/200° NGERSOLL & ROON	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404		TORRES, JOSEPH D	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2133	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DA	AYS	01/08/2007	PAF	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/645,560	HUANG ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
	•	Joseph D. Torres	2133	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	1 .)SS
Period fo	• •			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS INSTRUCTION OF THE MAILING THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS. cause the application to become ABAN	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this common DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	
Status				
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 At</u>	ugust 2004		
2a)□		action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar		nrosecution as to the m	orite ie
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under E			CINS IS
Dispositi	on of Claims	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	Hom conclusion.		
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement		
	on Papers	``		
	•			
	The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached O	TICE Action or form PTO-	152.
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) 🗌 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Appl	ication No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been red	ceived in this National Sta	ige
	application from the International Bureau	• • •		
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not rec	eived.	
Attachmen	(Ic)			
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4 \	(DTO 440)	
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔀 Interview Sum Paper No(s)/M	mary (P1O-413) ail Date. <u>20061229</u> .	
3) 🔲 Infom	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of Inform	mal Patent Application	
Paper	No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- 1. Claims 1-14, drawn to A method for storing a PDU and requesting retransmission, classified in class 714, subclass 748.
- 11. Claims 15 and 16, drawn to A receiver with a processor and local memory for compressing and storing in local memory the retrieved PDU, classified in class 714, subclass 763.
- III. Claims 17 and 18, drawn to Computer-readable medium for storing instruction implementing a method for compressing and storing punctured PDUs, classified in class 714, subclass 790.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as process (Group I) and apparatus (Group II) for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process (Group I) is directed to retransmission used in an ARQ communication system.

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one

subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination Group I has separate utility such as in an ARQ communication system. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Page 3

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Inventions Group II and Group III are related as process (Group III) and apparatus (Group II) for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the as process (Group III) can be used in a device that only stores punctured PDUs.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,560

Art Unit: 2133

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Steve Dubois on 12/22/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

Art Unit: 2133

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Torres whose telephone number is (571) 272-3829. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2133

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joseph D. Torres, PhD Primary Examiner Art Unit 2133

JOSEPH D. TOHRED PRIMARY EXAMINER PRIMARY EXAMINER PRIMARY CENTER 2100